

REMARKS:

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated February 23, 2009. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. Claims 2-6 remain dependent on Claim 1. Withdrawn Claim 7 is being maintained in the application pending the possible filing of a divisional application thereof.

It is respectfully submitted that parent Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2-4 and 6 are patentable over Campbell, et al. and its dependent Claim 5 is patentable over Campbell, et al. in view of Nishihara. Claim 1 has been amended to point out that "the solution viscosity is less than 140 ml/g, measured to ISO 307 in a sulfuric acid solution comprising 0.005 g/ml of specimen". Support for this feature is found in the Specification at page 2, lines 24-26.

Accordingly, Claim 1 relates to a casing of an electronic device which comprises a cathode-ray tube or flat screen with the casing being produced from a heat-resistant, flame-retardant thermoplastic by an injection-molding process. As defined in Claim 1 the plastic has a polyamide-based structure and is characterized in that the plastic comprises a mixture of at least two polyamides with different solution viscosity and specifically with the solution viscosity noted above.

Campbell et al. disclose a casing for an electronic device which is suitable for use as a monitor housing. The computer monitor may include a cathode ray tube. The casing comprises a heat-resistant, flame-retardant thermoplastic, wherein the thermoplastic material may have a polyamide-based structure. However, Campbell et al. do not explicitly disclose that a mixture of at least two polyamides with different solution viscosities is used. Further, Campbell et al. do not teach that the solution viscosity of the polyamides used is less than 140 ml/g, measured to ISO 307 in a sulfuric acid solution comprising 0.005 g/ml of specimen.

An advantage of the feature that the solution viscosity is less than 140 ml/g, measured to ISO 307 in a sulfuric acid solution comprising 0.005 g/ml of specimen, is that a polyamide

having these features allows a rapid distribution of the polymer melt within the mold and therefore short cycle times and clean surfaces can be achieved.

However, even if, arguendo, it has been obvious to a skilled person that while using a blend of one molecular weight grade of at least one polyamide and a relatively lower molecular weight grade of another (similar) polyamide, the polyamides used have different solution viscosities because those are different materials, there is no hint given by Campbell et al. that the solution viscosity of the polyamide is less than 140 ml/g, measured to ISO 307 in a sulfuric acid solution comprising 0.005 g/ml of specimen.

The deficiencies of Campbell et al. are not overcome by any hypothetical combination with Nishihara.

Since none of the cited documents discloses a mixture of at least two polyamides with different solution viscosity, wherein the solution viscosity is less than 140 ml/g, measured to ISO 307 in a sulfuric acid solution comprising 0.005 g/ml of specimen, the features of amended claim 1 are also not obvious to a skilled person by combining Campbell et al. with any of the other documents, such as Nishihara.

Since none of the documents being identified discloses a mixture of at least two polyamides with different solution viscosity wherein the solution viscosity is less than 140 ml/g, measured to ISO 307 in a sulfuric acid solution comprising 0.005 g/ml of specimen and further, none of the documents discloses that a polymer solution having such a solution viscosity allows a rapid distribution in the mold and therefore clean surfaces and short cycle times, the subject-matter of the amended claim 1 is not obvious to a skilled person. Therefore, the subject matter of amended claim 1 is new and unobvious. Accordingly, Claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowed.

In view of the above remarks and amendments this application should be passed to issue.

Dated: 5/19/09

Respectfully submitted,

By Harold Pezzner

Harold Pezzner

Registration No.: 22,112
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
Correspondence Customer Number: 23416
Attorney for Applicant

686513